

FILED

MAY 16 2025

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**

CLERK, U.S. DISTRICT COURT
NORTH DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

JANVIER VILLARS, Sui Juris and
on behalf of similarly affected parties, et. al.
Petitioner,

V.

CASE NO.:

CV25

4239

LJC

Pam Bondi, in her official and individual capacity
Ashley Moody, in her official and individual capacity
Christopher Wray, in his official and individual capacity as the Former Director of the
Federal Bureau of Investigation (2017–2024), and
Kash Patel, in his official and individual capacity as Current Director of the Federal
Bureau of Investigation (2025–present),
Securities and Exchange Commission (SEC) (for refusal to investigate insider trading
by SCOTUS Justices and Congress members holding META stock)
John and Jane Does 1-100 (Unknown Deep State Operatives) et. al.,
RESPONDENTS,

**EMERGENCY PETITION TO RESTORE CONSTITUTIONAL
GOVERNANCE THE COURTS MUST AFFORD DUE PROCESS OR
FORFEIT LEGITIMACY — SIC SEMPER TYRANNIS.**

EMERGENCY EX PARTE MOTION

FOR IMMEDIATE

CONSTITUTIONAL ADJUDICATION and

OBJECTION TO ABSTENTION, REMOVAL, OR TRANSFER

VERIFIED SUPPLEMENTAL PETITION

**FOR DECLARATORY AND EMERGENCY INJUNCTIVE RELIEF,
CONSTITUTIONAL RESTORATION, AND PUBLIC RIGHT TO
INTERVENE**

Petitioner, Janvier Villars, sui juris, individually and on behalf of similarly situated persons, respectfully submits this Verified Supplemental Emergency Petition for Declaratory Relief, Emergency Injunctive Relief, and Constitutional Restoration, and demands immediate judicial action under the First, Fourth, Fifth, Ninth, Tenth, and Fourteenth Amendments to the United States Constitution, the Supremacy Clause, Article III, and applicable federal statutes.

Petitioner also respectfully moves this Court to recognize and invite the intervention of affected parties, including association members, TikTok users, and other citizens whose rights to speech, property, privacy, and due process have been systematically deprived under color of law through the fraudulent exploitation of unconstitutional judicial doctrines.

I. PRELIMINARY STATEMENT

This nation stands at a constitutional crossroads.

The American judiciary, intended to be the shield of the people's rights, has been weaponized against those very rights through the fraudulent blueprint authorized by landmark Supreme Court decisions beginning with *Stump v. Sparkman* (1978), expanding through *Citizens United v. FEC*, *Dobbs v. Jackson Women's Health Organization*, and culminating in the *TikTok ban* case. These rulings dismantled essential constitutional protections, expanding judicial and executive

discretion to deprive individuals of life, liberty, property, speech, and privacy without meaningful remedy.

This Petition demonstrates how these doctrines, born of judicial betrayal, have cascaded into state and lower federal courts—particularly the Florida court system—where they have been exploited by corrupt officials, Bar Association attorneys, and complicit judges to systematically strip over 560 homeowners, including Petitioner Janvier Villars, of their rights to due process, association, property, privacy, and speech.

Through fraud upon the court, color of law deprivations, and weaponized immunity doctrines, Respondents and their agents have deprived Petitioner and similarly situated citizens of constitutional guarantees, transforming the judiciary into an instrument of extortion, coercion, and authoritarian control.

This is not isolated misconduct—it is the **foreseeable result** of the Supreme Court’s own blueprint, granting unchecked discretion to government officers while dismantling the ability of individuals to defend themselves under law.

The Florida judiciary’s refusal to adjudicate subject matter jurisdiction challenges, its endorsement of fraudulent receiverships, its suppression of lawful Association elections, and its coercion of elections for private gain, mirror the SCOTUS-enabled structural fraud now manifesting nationally.

The recent TikTok ban and coerced IP transfers to Meta further exemplify the national expansion of this authoritarian judicial-executive complex, silencing millions of citizens and unlawfully confiscating property interests.

The Constitution cannot coexist with a system that shields fraud, coerces obedience through lawless courts, and denies the dignity and sovereignty of the People.

Petitioner demands that this Court:

- Adjudicate the constitutional crisis presented herein;
- Declare the fraudulent state judicial acts void ab initio;
- Restore the contractual and constitutional rights of the duly elected 2023 Association board;
- Suspend all ongoing unlawful judicial orders pending constitutional review;
- Recognize and preserve the public's right to intervene in defense of their own liberty, speech, property, and association.

The People stand at the threshold.

The Courts must choose: **Constitutional restoration—or forfeiture of all legitimacy.**

II. JURISDICTION, VENUE, AND STANDING

A. Jurisdiction

This Court has jurisdiction over this action pursuant to:

- **28 U.S.C. § 1331**, as this action arises under the Constitution and laws of the United States;
- **28 U.S.C. § 1361**, as this is a mandamus action to compel federal officers and officials to perform their constitutional duties;
- **28 U.S.C. §§ 2201–2202**, granting authority to declare the rights and legal relations of parties affected by ongoing constitutional violations;

- **5 U.S.C. §§ 702–706**, under the Administrative Procedure Act, for unlawful agency conduct where applicable;
- The inherent equitable powers of the federal judiciary to protect constitutional rights against systemic fraud and abuse under **Marbury v. Madison**, 5 U.S. 137 (1803).

Additionally, **the Supremacy Clause of the United States Constitution.**

Article VI, Clause 2 vests this Court with the duty to intervene where state actors or federal officers engage in open defiance of constitutional mandates.

B. Venue

Venue properly lies in the United States District Court for the Northern District of California under:

- **28 U.S.C. § 1391(b)(2)**, because a substantial part of the events or omissions giving rise to the claims occurred nationally, and because this district remains a proper forum for addressing systemic constitutional violations affecting citizens across the United States, including those harmed by national actions like the TikTok speech ban.

Additionally, under extraordinary circumstances where national constitutional rights are endangered through coordinated government misconduct, jurisdiction and venue are properly invoked wherever constitutional redress remains viable.

C. Standing

Petitioner Janvier Villars possesses standing under Article III of the Constitution because:

- He has suffered **concrete and particularized injury**—including deprivation of property, due process, speech, privacy, and association rights—traceable to the Respondents' and agents' unconstitutional acts and omissions;

- The injuries are **actual and ongoing**, not hypothetical, including unlawful judicial receivership, extortion of funds under color of law, Board election interference, deprivation of access to the courts, and systemic chilling of constitutional rights;
- The injuries are **redressable** by declaratory, injunctive, and equitable relief from this Court;
- As a member of an Association of over 560 owners similarly deprived of constitutional rights, Petitioner also acts in the protection of the public interest against systemic government betrayal;
- In light of the TikTok ban and coerced intellectual property seizures, **TikTok users, video creators, and citizens silenced by the unconstitutional executive-judicial alliance** similarly possess standing and are invited to intervene in this action to protect their First Amendment, property, and privacy rights.

Where government officials—state or federal—violate the Constitution and leave no lawful remedy within their own systems, **it is the solemn duty of the federal judiciary to provide one.**

No immunity, no doctrine, no fabricated procedural shield can override the supreme law of the land.

II. FACTUAL BACKGROUND

A. Local Manifestations of National Judicial Betrayal

Since at least 2017, the Florida judiciary, under color of law and with reckless disregard for constitutional safeguards, has engaged in a pattern and practice of systemic due process deprivations against Petitioner and over 560 similarly situated property owners at Buckley Towers Condominium Association.

In direct reflection of the Supreme Court's fraudulent blueprint established by *Stump v. Sparkman* (1978) — shielding judicial officers from accountability even for acts outside lawful jurisdiction — Florida judges have:

- **Ignored and refused to adjudicate challenges to Subject Matter Jurisdiction (SMJ)**, operating void proceedings as though jurisdiction were presumed rather than proven;
- **Facilitated the fraudulent seizure of the Association's governance**, including the illegal appointment of a receivership without affording due process protections or evidentiary hearings;
- **Suppressed free association and free speech** by unlawfully altering election procedures without lawful authority, stripping contractually-elected board members of their rights, and empowering partisan attorneys to control electoral outcomes;
- **Deprived property owners of their privacy, property, and liberty** without procedural safeguards, notice, or fair hearing, while protecting Bar Association attorneys from scrutiny or accountability.

Specifically, Judge Guzman unlawfully divested the Association and Petitioner Villars of their constitutional and contractual rights by appointing a receiver based on petitions filed by unauthorized, self-appointed attorneys without verifying legal standing or jurisdiction.

Then in 2024, Judge Del Rio exacerbated the constitutional injury by altering the Association's election procedures without statutory or contractual authority, coercing election outcomes to favor Bar-aligned actor Steven Katz' client (Plaintiff), and silencing dissent from duly elected board officers by prohibiting their counterclaims.

In each instance, **subject matter jurisdiction was absent an/or knowingly disregarded**, and **fraud on the court was facilitated and protected** by judicial actors under color of office.

B. The SCOTUS Blueprint: How Landmark Decisions Enabled Systemic Betrayal

These local deprivations are not isolated accidents — they are the **logical and foreseeable outcomes** of the Supreme Court's own betrayal of constitutional governance:

- In *Stump v. Sparkman* (1978), the Supreme Court extended absolute judicial immunity even for acts that violated due process, stripped bodily autonomy and privacy, inflicting permanent injury as a judicial right without having jurisdiction, **thereby inviting judges to operate without constitutional restraint (Base)**
- In *Citizens United v. FEC*, the Court fabricated corporate "personhood," expanding corporate and governmental influence over elections and political speech while diminishing the public's constitutional sovereignty, association rights, and equitable access to fair governance. Without Constitutional Authority explicitly afforded to ANY judge of the United States.
- In *Dobbs v. Jackson Women's Health Organization*, **the Court by sua sponte** retracted long-standing due process and privacy protections, emboldening state and judicial actors to selectively suppress rights based on ideology and politics. Transferring **-RESERVED Rights under the 9th and 10th-** from the living person- to the State Corporations run by the BAR Association, State officers. By obstructing the Indispensable Parties, the Female Class citizens, from challenging the State's control over **human (non-slaves) Reproductive Rights**.
- In the recent *TikTok ban* case, the judiciary facilitated the suppression of millions of Americans' speech rights, the seizure of intellectual property, and the coerced transfer of private assets to favored corporations—all without public consent, lawful due process, or constitutional justification. Without the court having actual injury, causation or redressability. But to deprive of 1st Amendment Rights without congress having to pass a law, or having to pass **Strict Scrutiny**.

Each of these landmark betrayals reinforced a single principle: **that government officers and judicial actors may now operate outside constitutional limits with practical impunity, so long as they cloak their actions in fabricated immunity and discretionary doctrines.**

This blueprint directly empowered the Florida judiciary's misconduct described above and rendered constitutional defenses effectively meaningless within the captured courts of the State.

C. The Broader National Crisis: Extending Beyond Florida

The misconduct at Buckley Towers is but one flashpoint in a broader national crisis:

- Across the United States, judicial and executive officials have embraced these SCOTUS-fabricated doctrines to shield themselves while depriving citizens of speech, property, privacy, and due process. **That is Life, Liberty and Property.**
- The TikTok ban exemplifies how the government now wields unreviewable power to silence citizens en masse, confiscate intellectual property without trial or compensation, and dictate public discourse—all while insulating itself from judicial redress.
- Common working-class Americans, association homeowners, TikTok creators, and ordinary citizens face systemic constitutional injury with no reliable remedy within captured lower courts.

Petitioner's injuries are thus emblematic of a larger constitutional collapse—a collapse whose root lies in the Supreme Court's betrayal of its own constitutional mandate and whose consequences now threaten every fundamental right of the people.

This Court must intervene not only to remedy the immediate injuries suffered by Petitioner, but to stem the tide of constitutional dissolution now threatening the Republic itself.

IV. LEGAL ARGUMENT

A. Fraud on the Court Nullifies All Judicial Acts Ab Initio

It is well-established that **fraud upon the court vitiates everything it touches**.

Judicial acts procured by fraud are **void ab initio**, not merely voidable.

(Hazel-Atlas Glass Co. v. Hartford-Empire Co., 322 U.S. 238 (1944); United States v. Throckmorton, 98 U.S. 61 (1878)).

In this case:

- Judges Guzman and Del Rio operated without lawful Subject Matter Jurisdiction (SMJ),
- Proceeded upon fraudulent petitions filed by unauthorized Bar attorneys (Katzman and others),
- Judges Guzman, Del Rio, Echarte, Cynamon, Diaz, 3rd DCA, Judge Ruiz of the SDC facilitated receivership seizures and election coercion. By denying procedural safeguards, notice, and concealing the lack of lawful authority in their courts,
- EACH judge refusing to afford the court with judicial findings on how they have Subject Matter Jurisdiction. Considered fraud on the court at concealing material evidence. While selectively affording protection to aligned parties, Bar-Licensed attorneys and judges.

Such acts are not protected by judicial immunity where jurisdiction is absent or where acts are undertaken in conspiracy with private parties to deprive constitutional rights.

(*Dennis v. Sparks*, 449 U.S. 24 (1980)).

Thus, all resulting judicial orders—including the receivership appointment, election coercions, and ownership divestitures—are **null and void** as a matter of constitutional law.

B. Strict Scrutiny Obliterates the Judicial Fabrications of Immunity and Personhood

Where fundamental rights—speech, property, privacy, liberty—are infringed, government action must survive **strict scrutiny**:

- **Compelling government interest**, and
- **Narrowly tailored means**.

None of the doctrines enabling the abuses at issue here—**absolute judicial immunity**, **corporate personhood**, or **executive discretion over speech platforms**—can survive this scrutiny.

Specifically:

- *Citizens United* created a judicial fiction of corporate personhood without compelling interest or tailoring, displacing the natural rights of real citizens.
- *Stump* extended absolute judicial immunity beyond constitutional bounds, even for acts lacking jurisdiction or violating basic rights, obliterating accountability. Affording

Judges and other government actors with unconstitutional powers to violate Constitutional rights.

- ***Dobbs*** authorized selective stripping of privacy rights based on ideology, without neutral principles. Supporting authoritarian interests over people to be lawfully enforced under a criminalized state law. Now is against abortion, tomorrow for the economic welfare of the nation, the sterilization of the poor, or the unwanted class. With the threat of deportation to another nation's prison. **Without affording due process**, as it is currently being done.
- **The *TikTok ban*** unlawfully suppresses speech and seizes intellectual property without individualized due process, targeting millions without justification.

Each of these doctrines, now weaponized locally in Florida courts, **fails constitutional scrutiny and must be declared void ab initio.**

C. Equitable Grounds Demand Immediate Judicial Intervention

Equity abhors a forfeiture

No right can arise from fraud

He who seeks equity must come with clean hands

By refusing to adjudicate jurisdiction, facilitating fraud, and denying due process, the Florida judiciary forfeited any equitable claim to protection or deference.

Petitioner, as the injured party:

- Was deprived of due process and property rights through fraud on the courts,
- Was stripped of association and contractual governance rights without a lawful hearing,

- Was denied judicial review and procedural fairness at every level up to the Fed. SDC,
- Continues to suffer irreparable injury without adequate remedy at law.

Where constitutional violations are systemic, irreparable, and ongoing, **equity demands immediate suspension of fraudulent judicial acts and restoration of the original constitutional status quo ante.** (*Marbury v. Madison*, 5 U.S. 137 (1803)).

Moreover, the Court must recognize and preserve the right of all similarly situated citizens—including association members, TikTok users, and other silenced individuals—to intervene and defend their constitutional rights within this action.

V. PRAYER FOR RELIEF

WHEREFORE, based on the foregoing, Mr. Villars respectfully demands the following relief from this Honorable Court:

A. DECLARATORY RELIEF

1. **That this Court declare that Judge Guzman lacked Subject Matter Jurisdiction (SMJ)** to appoint a receiver over Buckley Towers Condominium Association, and that all related judicial acts, including the divestment of Association authority and property rights from Petitioner Janvier Villars and the 2023 duly elected Board, are **void ab initio**;
2. **That this Court declare that Judge Vivianne Del Rio lacked legal and constitutional authority** to alter the Association's election procedures, suspend

contractual election authority of the Board, or empower attorney Steven Katz to control election outcomes, and that such acts were undertaken in violation of state law, Association bylaws, and constitutional protections;

3. **That this Court declare the 2023 Association Board to be the only duly elected and lawful governing body, and that any acts purporting to remove, bypass, or override that Board are void as the product of fraud upon the court and unlawful coercion;**
4. **That this Court declare all resulting orders from the Florida judiciary arising from these void acts—including receivership, elections, lien enforcement, property takings, and denial of redress—to be constitutionally void and of no legal effect;**
5. **That this Court declare the landmark decisions of the U.S. Supreme Court in *Stump v. Sparkman*, *Citizens United v. FEC*, *Dobbs v. Jackson*, and the *TikTok ban* case to be structurally flawed and unconstitutional in application, as they violate strict scrutiny, due process, and the foundational protections of the Constitution, and that they may not be relied upon to deprive citizens of rights under color of law.**

B. EMERGENCY INJUNCTIVE RELIEF

6. **That this Court issue an immediate emergency injunction** suspending all ongoing Florida judicial orders related to:
 - The unlawful receivership of Buckley Towers Condominium Association;

- The coercion or certification of any elections not lawfully conducted by the 2023 elected Board;
- The enforcement of fraudulent liens, takings, or foreclosures arising from such void judicial actions;
- The continued suppression of Petitioner Villars' access to records, courts, or Association governance;

pending this Court's full adjudication of the constitutional merits of this Petition.

C. EQUITABLE RELIEF AND PUBLIC INTERVENTION

7. That this Court preserve and affirm the right of similarly situated citizens to intervene in this action pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 24(a), including but not limited to:

- Members of the Buckley Towers Condominium Association;
- Other association property owners who are subjected to fraudulent governance manipulation;
- TikTok users, video creators, and public citizens are silenced, deprived of intellectual property, or coerced by the executive-judicial partnership as manifest in the TikTok ban;

who have suffered injury in fact traceable to the same judicial blueprint of betrayal challenged herein.

8. That this Court grant all further declaratory, injunctive, and equitable relief necessary to restore the constitutional status quo, vacate unlawful state actions, and protect Petitioner and the public from continuing injury.

Respectfully submitted,

This 29th day of April, 2025.

Janvier Villars, Sui Juris

VI. CERTIFICATION AND SIGNATURE BLOCK

Certification Under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 11

Under **Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 11(b)**, Petitioner hereby certifies that to the best of his knowledge, information, and belief, formed after an inquiry reasonable under the circumstances:

1. This Petition is not being presented for any improper purpose, such as to harass, cause unnecessary delay, or needlessly increase the cost of litigation;
2. The claims, defenses, and other legal contentions are warranted by existing law or by a nonfrivolous argument for extending, modifying, or reversing existing law or for establishing new law in support of constitutional governance;

3. The factual contentions have evidentiary support or, if specifically so identified, will likely have evidentiary support after a reasonable opportunity for further investigation or discovery;
4. The denials of factual contentions are warranted on the evidence or, if specifically so identified, are reasonably based on belief or a lack of information.

Petitioner proceeds **in good faith**, seeking only restoration of constitutional rights and equitable protection for himself and all similarly situated citizens against systemic government betrayal.

EMERGENCY EX PARTE MOTION
FOR IMMEDIATE
CONSTITUTIONAL ADJUDICATION,

EMERGENCY INJUNCTION, AND RESTORATION OF DUE PROCESS RIGHTS

Petitioner Janvier Villars, pursuant to the United States Constitution, 28 U.S.C. § 1651 (All Writs Act), Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 65(b)(1) (Ex Parte Injunctions), and the inherent equitable powers of the Court, respectfully moves this Court on an emergency ex parte basis for immediate adjudication of subject matter jurisdiction failures, declaration of unconstitutional deprivation of fundamental rights, issuance of an emergency injunction suspending all void Florida judicial orders pending final constitutional review, and preservation of the public's right to intervene in defense of constitutional liberty.

Immediate relief is warranted because irreparable harm to Petitioner's constitutional rights is ongoing and accelerating, no adequate remedy at law exists, and the injuries described are the direct and foreseeable product of a national judicial blueprint of betrayal that now threatens the rule of law itself.

I. INTRODUCTION

Petitioner brings this Emergency Ex Parte Motion because the constitutional injuries detailed in his Verified Supplemental Emergency Petition are not abstract grievances — they are ongoing, escalating deprivations of property, due process, free speech, privacy, and association rights, perpetrated under color of law through systemic fraud on the court.

The judicial abuses suffered by Petitioner and similarly situated persons:

- Originate from the Supreme Court's structural betrayal of constitutional protections beginning with *Stump v. Sparkman* (1978) and extending through *Citizens United*, *Dobbs*, and the TikTok speech ban;
- Have cascaded into state and lower federal courts, including the Florida judiciary, where Subject Matter Jurisdiction (SMJ) challenges are ignored, receiverships are fraudulently imposed, elections are unlawfully seized, and citizens are denied even the pretense of due process;

- Mirror the national pattern of judicial-executive collusion, enabling the weaponization of the courts against the working class, homeowners, and public dissenters.

Every day that passes without immediate constitutional intervention, Petitioner — and the broader public — suffer irreparable loss:

- Loss of speech, as seen in the TikTok ban and social media censorship;
- Loss of property, as seen in unlawful Association receiverships and lien seizures;
- Loss of privacy, as government agents strip contractual and associational rights under fraudulent judicial orders;
- Loss of dignity, as courts deny hearings, fabricate protections for fraud, and treat citizens as subjects rather than sovereigns.

The Florida courts' open defiance of jurisdictional limits, combined with national suppression of constitutional rights under fabricated immunities, presents a constitutional crisis of the highest magnitude — one that demands immediate judicial action without delay.

Accordingly, Petitioner respectfully moves this Court to act ex parte to:

- Issue emergency declaratory relief confirming the constitutional violations and SMJ failures;

- Suspend all ongoing enforcement of void state judicial orders pending final adjudication;
- Restore Petitioner's property, association, speech, and due process rights to their constitutional status quo ante;
- Preserve and invite public intervention to defend the Republic's constitutional framework.

**The Constitution cannot defend itself.
The time for judicial courage is now.**

II. LEGAL STANDARD FOR EMERGENCY EX PARTE RELIEF

Federal courts possess both the authority and the solemn duty to intervene immediately where constitutional rights face imminent, irreparable harm and where ordinary judicial processes would render any final remedy meaningless.

An Ex Parte Temporary Restraining Order (TRO) or emergency relief is appropriate under **Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 65(b)(1)** where:

- (1) Immediate and irreparable injury, loss, or damage will result before the adverse party can be heard in opposition; and
- (2) The movant's attorney (or movant pro se) certifies in writing the efforts made to give notice and the reasons why notice should not be required.

Additionally, **the All Writs Act, 28 U.S.C. § 1651**, empowers federal courts to issue "all writs necessary or appropriate in aid of their respective jurisdictions and agreeable to the usages and principles of law," including mandamus and constitutional protective orders.

Courts also hold inherent equitable authority to prevent manifest injustice and constitutional violation where no adequate remedy at law exists.

In this case:

- Petitioner has suffered and continues to suffer irreparable injury to fundamental rights under the First, Fourth, Fifth, Ninth, Tenth, and Fourteenth Amendments;
- Judicial officers and Bar Association actors have acted without lawful jurisdiction, rendering their proceedings void and ongoing injuries unconstitutional;
- Delays inherent in adversarial proceedings would leave Petitioner, and similarly situated citizens, without effective remedy for deprivations that intensify daily;
- Public interests overwhelmingly favor immediate constitutional intervention to prevent the continued collapse of due process and equitable protections under color of law.

Accordingly, the standards for immediate ex parte action are fully satisfied.

The Court possesses both the power and the duty to issue emergency relief to preserve constitutional order, prevent injustice, and safeguard the Republic's foundational principles.

III. LEGAL ARGUMENT

IMMEDIATE ACTION IS REQUIRED TO PREVENT THE ONGOING CONSTITUTIONAL COLLAPSE and IRREPARABLE HARM

A. Petitioner Faces Immediate and Irreparable Injury Without Emergency Relief

Petitioner's injuries are not theoretical — they are present, ongoing, and intensifying:

- **Deprivation of Property:** Through fraudulent receivership imposed without SMJ, Petitioner and similarly situated homeowners have been stripped of control over Association assets and subjected to unlawful lien enforcement without due process.
- **Suppression of Free Speech and Association:** Judicial interference with Association elections and the broader national suppression embodied in the TikTok ban constitute ongoing First Amendment violations, silencing political expression and collective governance rights.
- **Violation of Due Process and Privacy:** Courts' refusal to adjudicate jurisdiction, concealment of fraud, and denial of evidentiary hearings reflect systemic abandonment of fundamental procedural protections.
- **Loss of Dignity and Sovereignty:** By treating citizens as mere subjects to judicial will, without recourse or hearing, the Florida judiciary has denied Petitioner the inherent dignity guaranteed by the Fifth and Fourteenth Amendments.

Without immediate intervention, these constitutional deprivations will permanently alter the contractual, property, and civil rights of Petitioner and hundreds of similarly situated persons.

No monetary award could later compensate for the deprivation of speech, property sovereignty, privacy, or due process.

The harm is irreparable.

B. Public Interest Overwhelmingly Supports Emergency Judicial Action

The constitutional structure of the Republic rests upon the principle that government exists to serve and protect the rights of the People—not to weaponize courts against them.

Here:

- Judicial immunity doctrines fabricated in *Stump* and expanded by *Citizens United* and *Dobbs* have been transformed into instruments of oppression.
- Government officers, including state judges and Bar attorneys, now operate without meaningful constitutional restraint, exploiting fabricated doctrines to shield fraud, suppress dissent, and confiscate property.
- The TikTok ban demonstrates the national scope of this crisis, as millions are silenced and deprived of property without individualized due process or public consent.

Preserving public confidence in the rule of law, ensuring meaningful access to courts, and protecting free political association are paramount public interests.

Without immediate action, these foundational pillars face irreversible collapse.

C. Likelihood of Success on the Merits Strongly Favors Emergency Relief

Petitioner's Verified Supplemental Emergency Petition demonstrates:

- Clear evidence of fraud on the court,
- Clear absence of subject matter jurisdiction in key state judicial actions,
- Systematic due process violations,
- Constitutional harm traceable directly to governmental actors operating under color of law,
- Absence of lawful defenses under strict scrutiny standards.

The likelihood of ultimate success on the merits is overwhelming based on uncontested constitutional violations, fraud standards, and historical precedent.

D. No Adequate Remedy at Law Exists

Once speech is suppressed, property is unlawfully seized, or privacy is destroyed under color of law, no monetary award can restore constitutional status.

Only immediate injunctive and declaratory relief can:

- Prevent further damage,
- Preserve Petitioner's Dignity, privacy, property and association rights,
- Restore free political participation, Contract Clause respect.
- Uphold the rule of law against systemic governmental betrayal.

**Delay is intolerable.
Action must be immediate.**

IV. RELIEF REQUESTED

Accordingly, Petitioner respectfully requests that this Court, on an emergency ex parte basis:

1. Declare Judicial Acts Void Ab Initio

- Issue an emergency declaratory judgment that the acts of Florida state judges, including Judge Guzman's receivership orders and Judge Del Rio's election manipulations, were undertaken without Subject Matter Jurisdiction (SMJ) and are therefore void ab initio under constitutional law.

2. Issue Emergency Injunctive Relief

- Issue an emergency injunction immediately suspending all ongoing enforcement of judicial orders arising from:
 - The unlawful receivership imposed on Buckley Towers Condominium Association;
 - The alteration or coercion of Association elections;
 - The enforcement of fraudulent liens, foreclosures, or property seizures linked to these void acts;
 - The denial of access to Association governance and records.

3. Restore Constitutional Status Quo Ante

- Order the restoration of the 2023 duly elected Association Board, recognized as the only lawful and contractually legitimate governing authority of the Association.
- Restore Petitioner's access to Association governance, property rights, and records without unlawful interference.

4. Preserve and Invite Public Intervention

- Issue an order affirming the right of similarly situated citizens to intervene in this proceeding under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 24(a), including but not limited to:
 - Buckley Towers Condominium Association owners;
 - Other affected association property owners nationwide;
 - TikTok users, video creators, and others harmed by the unconstitutional suppression of speech and unlawful intellectual property seizures.

5. Set Immediate Hearing (If Necessary)

- Alternatively, set an emergency hearing at the earliest available time (within 10 days) to allow the Court to address the constitutional crisis, hear additional evidence if necessary, and issue permanent declaratory and injunctive relief protecting Petitioner's and the public's constitutional rights.

6. Award Such Other Relief as the Court Deems Just and Proper

- Grant any further declaratory, injunctive, or equitable relief necessary to:
 - Prevent irreparable constitutional injury,
 - Restore the rule of law,
 - Preserve the supremacy of the United States Constitution.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: April 29th, 2025

/s/ Janvier Villars
Janvier Villars
Petitioner, Sui Juris

V. CERTIFICATION FOR EX PARTE MOTION

Pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 65(b)(1)(B), Petitioner hereby certifies:

- That immediate and irreparable injury, loss, and damage will result before the adverse parties can be heard in opposition, including the continued unlawful deprivation of constitutional rights to property, speech, privacy, and due process;
- That notice to the adverse parties is impracticable and futile because:
 - The very agencies, officers, and judicial actors who are responsible for the constitutional deprivations constitute the adverse parties;
 - Prior efforts to obtain redress within the state courts have been systematically obstructed by fraud upon the court, denial of jurisdictional review, and open bias favoring Bar Association attorneys and governmental defendants;
 - Delay for adversarial briefing would exacerbate irreparable constitutional injuries and render any final judgment ineffective.

Petitioner proceeds in good faith and in urgent defense of constitutional governance.

He respectfully moves this Court to act without delay to protect his rights and the rights of similarly situated citizens now facing systemic deprivation under color of law.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: April 29th, 2025

Janvier Villars
Petitioner, Sui Juris

**NOTICE OF STRUCTURAL CONSTITUTIONAL JURISDICTION AND
PREEMPTIVE OBJECTION TO ABSTENTION, REMOVAL, OR
TRANSFER**

Petitioner, Janvier Villars, respectfully submits this Notice to preserve and affirm the jurisdiction of this Court over the pending constitutional and structural claims presented in this matter.

1. Structural Constitutional Claims Demand Mandatory Federal Jurisdiction: This Petition raises direct challenges under the Supremacy Clause (Article VI), the Due Process Clause (Amendments V and XIV), and structural constitutional violations arising from unlawful judicial doctrines, fraud upon the courts, and deprivation of natural and reserved rights under the Ninth and Tenth Amendments. Pursuant to *Ex parte Young*, 209 U.S. 123 (1908), *Marbury v. Madison*, 5 U.S. 137 (1803), and 28 U.S.C. §§ 1331, 1343, 1361, no court may decline jurisdiction over active constitutional violations.

2. SDC Proceedings Do Not Preclude NDC Jurisdiction: Although Petitioner has filed a distinct Writ in the Southern District of Florida (SDC) related to procedural due process deprivations by state actors, the claims here extend to a broader constitutional structural challenge directly against systemic deprivation authorized by SCOTUS landmark decisions (including *Murthy*, *Dobbs*, *Citizens United*, and *Stump*). Therefore, SDC proceedings are factually related but legally distinct and do not bar, divest, or defer the exercise of this Court's jurisdiction.

3. Original Jurisdiction Cannot Be Seized by SCOTUS: Article III, Section 2 of the United States Constitution strictly limits the Supreme Court's original jurisdiction. This

case, invoking individual civil rights violations under 42 U.S.C. §§ 1983, 1985, and 1986, properly arises in this Court under federal question jurisdiction and is not subject to Supreme Court original jurisdiction under 28 U.S.C. § 1251.

4. Preemptive Objection to Transfer, Abstention, or Procedural Dismissal: Petitioner formally objects to any motion, sua sponte action, or procedural maneuver seeking to transfer, stay, dismiss, or defer this action on the basis of abstention doctrines, pendency of related actions, or claims of forum non conveniens. The constitutional harms presented demand immediate adjudication, and any delay or evasion would itself constitute a further actionable deprivation under the Due Process Clause and the Supremacy Clause.

5. Conclusion: Petitioner respectfully demands this Court retain full jurisdiction, adjudicate the constitutional questions presented, and resist any procedural attempt to shield Respondents from accountability.

Declaration Under Penalty of Perjury Pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1746

I, Janvier Villars, sui juris, declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the United States of America that the foregoing supplemental filing, evidence, and arguments submitted herein are true and correct to the best of my knowledge, information, and belief, and are submitted not for purposes of delay, obstruction, or any improper purpose, but solely to assist the Court in the faithful discharge of its constitutional duty.



Respectfully,

Janvier Villars, Sui Juris